

An Humble / 486 A. 65.

INQUIRY
INTO THE
SCRIPTURE-ACCOUNT
OF
JESUS CHRIST.
OR, A
SHORT ARGUMENT
Concerning
His Deity and Glory,
According to the
GOSPEL.

1 Cor. viii. 5. *To us there is but One God, and he is the Father, of whom are all things; and One Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.*

Augus. cont. Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.

Nec ego Nicanam Synodum tibi, nec tu Ariminensem mihi debes, ob-jicere. Scripturarum Authoritatibus, &c.

Thou shalt not urge me with the Council of Ariminum, nor I thee with the Council of Nice, but let us decide the Cause by Scripture Authority

Printed in the Year M DCC II.

A Short
ARGUMENT,
Concerning the
DEITY of our
LORD JESUS CHRIST.

IHAT the Blessed Jesus has the number, one Person is Stiled God, as *Moses* Title of God, ascribed sometimes to him in the H. Scriptures, is twice so called; a God to *Aaron*, Ex. 4. 16. and afterwards a God to *Pharaoh*. Ch 7. 1. is not denied by *Arians*, or *Socinians*, but it remains to be Examined in what Sense that Character, as given to him, is intended. Nor is this an unreasonable Permission, now as he who alone is God, or needless enquiry, since it is beyond all reasonable denial, that the Title of God is given in very different Senses in the Scripture.

is twice so called; a God to *Aaron*, Ex. 4. 16. and afterwards a God to *Pharaoh*. Ch 7. 1. and thus the Devil is called the God of this World. i. e. the Prince and mighty Ruler of it; tho' by unjust Usurpation, and Gods

and thus the Devil is called the God of this World. i. e. the Prince and mighty Ruler of it; tho' by unjust Usurpation, and Gods

i. Sometimes it signifies the most High, *Fof.* 22. 22. or the Chief of all Gods, with Perfect and Infinite Being, who is of him whom none of those Gods may be compared. *Pf.* 86. 8. *Pf.* 135. 5. so *Philo* denies Authority, nor any thing to another; scribes him, to be not only the *God of Men*, and this is what is most commonly intended, when we speak of *God* in ordinary discourse, and in Prayer and Praise; we in the *O. T.* when it is designed to make mean it of *God* in the most Eminent Sense. a most Magnificent mention of his Peerless

2. At other times it has a lower Sense, Greatness and Glory. Equivalent to this and is made the Character of Persons who I take that Title to be, which is so much are invested with Subordinate Authority used in the N. T. viz. the God and Father and Power, from that Supream Being: ther of our Lord Jesus Christ, *Eph* 1. 3. 17. Thus *Angels* are stiled *Gods*: *Ps.* 97. 7. *Ps.* 8. 5. *the God of our Lord Jesus, the Father of*
Ibou' hast made him a little lower than the Glory. For since Jesus Christ is the Chief Gods; as 'tis in the *Margine*; So *Magistrates* of all Subordinate Powers, *Rev.* 1. 5. *the*
strates are Gods; *Ex.* 22. 28. *Ps.* 82. 1. *John Prince of the Kings of the Earth,* and far
10. 34. 35. and sometimes in the singular above the greatest Angels, *Eph.* 1. 21. *the*

Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, he who Self, my Self, why hast thou forsaken me? is Stiled the God of our Lord Jesus Christ This God then was distinct from himself, is therein, in Effect, Said the God of as he declares in other places, John 7. 17. Gods, or above all Gods. . . . *he shall know my Doctrine, whether it be of*

Now the Question to be resolved is, in *God, or whether I speak of myself.* So John which of these two Senses Christ is said to 8. 42. where 'tis to be noted that he does be God in the Holy Scriptures; the bare not distinguish himself from him, As the Character of *God* determines nothing in *Father*, but as *God*; and therefore, in all this case, because it belongs both to the just Construction, he cannot be supposed Supream and Subordinate Beings in Power to be that self same God, from whom he and Authority; But the Question is, whe- Distinguishes, and to whom he Oppoleth ther Jesus Christ be the God of Gods, or himself. How manifestly are the one God, above all Gods? and the one Lord distinguish', 1 Cor. 8. 6.

He is indeed the *Lord of Lords*, but that and that there may be no just pretence to Notes an Inferior Character, compared say with *Placens*, that the God and the with that of *God of Gods*, as appears by that, Lord; or the Cause of which all things are, 1 Cor. 8. 5. tho', it be included in the and the Cause by or through which they Superior, so that he who is above all Gods, are, are but two things laid of the same is also over all Lords, but not contrariwise: one God; We may see them more clearly In short, has Jesus Christ any God over distinguishing, Eph. 4. 5, 6. where by the him, who has greater Authority, and Interpoling other things between the one greater Ability than himself or not? This Lord, and one God, viz. one *Faith*, one will decide the matter; for if he have a God *Baptism*; it appears evidently that these above him, then is he not the Absolutely were not intended as two Characters of the Supream God, tho' in Relation to Created same Being. I think that none who im- Beings, he may be a God (or Ruler) over partially attends to the Scripture History, all. can doubt, whether God, and his Christ,

Nor can we more clearly demonstrate are not two distinct things. this point, than by shewing; First, that Jesus Secondly, Our Lord Jesus owns not only Christ expressly speaks of another God than another than himself to be God; but also himself. Secondly, that he owns this God that *he is above*, or over himself, which is to be above, or over himself. Thirdly, That plainly intimated also by his Apostles: he wants those Supereminent and Infinite Himself loudly proclaims his Subjection to Perfections, which belong only to the Lord the Father in many Instances: In General, God of Gods: Of these I shall treat in a he declares his *Father to be greater than he*, manner suited to vulgar Capacities; for I John. 14. 28. 50. Ch. 10. 29. he says he judge it very indecent to speak or write of came not in his own, but his *Fathers Name* Important Articles, (which the Common or Authority, John 5. 43. That he sought People must believe, and must so far un- not his own, but Gods Glory, nor made his derstand) in such a manner as leaves them own Will, but Gods, his Rule; and in wholly unintelligible. such a Posture of Subjection *he came down*

First, Our Lord Jesus Christ expressly from *Heaven* into this Earth; so that it speaks of another God distinct from him- should seem, that Nature which did pre- self: Several times, we find him saying, exist, did ..not possess the Supream Will, *My God of another*, Mat. 27. 46. *My God*, even before it was incarnate, John 6. 38. *my God, Why hast thou forsaken me?* So John Again he owns his dependence upon his 20. 17. sure he intended not to say, *my God and Father, even for those Things,* which

which it is pretended belong to him as God, viz. the Power of working Miracles, to God, that is (not to the Father, Son, and John. 5. 19, 20. of raising the Dead, v. 26. Holy Ghost, as some pretend, but) the of executing universal Judgment, v. 27. of *Father only*; since it was the Father, Mat. all which he says, *of my own self I can do* 28. 18. who gave him all Power in Hea- nothing, v. 30. In like manner his Apostles ven and Earth, and who made him King declare his Subjection to another, nor only *in Zion*: Into his Hands he will make a as his Father, but *as his God*, which is Em- Surrender of all, in Testimony of his ha- phatically expressed, in calling the most B. ving done all in a Subordination to him; God, the God of our Lord Jesus, after and having Acted and Ruled in dependence his Humiliation was over; Eph. 1. 17. and on him, who shall have a Satisfactory, the Head of Christ is God; 1 Cor. 11. They Account of all given to him in the end, declare his Headship over the Universe, and This is a Glory peculiar to the Father, as the very Foundations of his Claim to Honour Supream.

and Service, to be owing to the gracious 3. Then the Son himself shall be Subject Gift of God, Phil 2. 9. *exaltans auct. et ad. to him that put all things under him*, i. e. and yet these are some of the highest Glo- to God his Father, that God may be all in ries of Jesus Christ.

Let me only add under this Head, that manifested by an open Solemn acknowledgment great Text, so full of irresistible evidence, ledgment of it, when he shall recognize the for proving an Inferiority in the Son to his Supremacy of the Father in that publick Father or to God, 1 Cor. 15. from the 24 v. Act of Surrender; so that, tho' formerly to the 29. where the Apostle says several (*in the present State*) all Judgment and Things to this purpose,

Rule was committed to the Son; yet then

1. That all Things are to be *put under* it shall be otherwise, and God will more Christ's Feet; all Enemies and Powers are immediately appear in the Government of to be Subdued to him: But adds that 'tis the future State, which shall not be so Manifest, God must be excepted out of these much Shared. Probably, between him Things that are under him; and that for and the Redeemer, as the present Adm- this reason, because 'tis he who did put nistration appears to be. This then will all under him; And how comes it to pass, be the Issue of all our Disputes; God all that it is so evident a Thing, that another *in all*, and the Son himself *Subject under* must be supposed to be the great Author *hinc*. Can any thing be more Expressive of this Triumph of Christ? Why might of an Inequality between God and Christ? it not be done by himself independently But it will be said by some, that by this as the Supream God, and then there need Son here, is meant the Son of Man, or have been no exception, of any one Be- Christ as Man; while as God, he shall ing, out of the all things under him? But not be Subjected to the Father.

the Apostle knew that Jesus Christ must. *Rif.* As there is no intimation of any needs Triumph by a Power derived from such distinction between the pretended God; to whom it was most eminently to two Natures of the Son here; so there is be ascribed, and then to one who had such enough in the Words, to shew, that they thoughts, it was manifest that there must be are spoken of him, under his Highest one excepted from the all Things under him, Capacity and Character; in somuch, that because he must needs be above Christ Monsieur Claude maintains it to be true who enables him to Subdue all things, or of the Son of God, as to his (supposed) makes him a God over all.

Divine Nature: But tho' there is no need,

of Supposing such a *Nature*, (which I thinke, what ever Character else they bear? think the Text plainly contradicts) yet So then Jesus Christ in his Highest Capa- his Reasons will hold so far, as to prove Christ is inferior to the Father; how can he be the Words do ipeak of Christ, under the same God, to which he is Subject, or of, Highest Character he bears, by the Name the same Rank and Dignity? of Son; for First, as he says, 'tis not said Thus it appears that Christ is so God, as to the Son of Man, but the Son absolutely be under a Superior God, who has set him over which he thinks in the Scripture Use verall: And Suitable to this, is that Account is wont to mean more than the Son of which the Scripture gives us of the God-head Man; and undoubtedly it imports all that of the B. Jesus, viz. Because he is invested comes under that Title; Nay more, 'tis said, with a God-like Authority and Power, from even the Son himself, with great Emphasis, the Supreme God his Father. Thus when qu. d. as Great and Glorious as he is with he was accused by the captious Jews, all his Grandeur and Power; he himself for assuming the Character of Son of God shall be Subject. Secondly, His Subjection (which they perversly wou'd stretch, as tho' being opposed to his Reign, both must be it implied an equality with God) John 10. understood of the same Subject; be sure 35, 56. he explains in what Sense only the delivering up the Kingdom can only he justified it, viz. as one whom the Father be done by the same to which it was committed ther had Sanctified, i.e. called to a greater mitted, and by which it was managed: Office, and honoured with an Higher Commission. Now I shall allow, that only in his humiliation than those Magistrates, on whom man's Nature Christ cou'd give up his the Scripture so freely bestows the Title Kingdom; but then 'tis, because 'tis as Man of Gods. So Heb 1. 8, 9. when he is called Delegated, and Inhabited by God, that he God, 'tis explained in what Sense, or of tways and manages this Kingdom; and if what sort of God, 'tis to be understood, this be allow'd (as I think it needs must) by saying that his God, (intimating he had that the Man Christ is sufficient, by help a God over him) had anointed him with from God, to manage his Universal Spirit. Oyl, &c. That is, had invested him with tual Kingdom, I see no reason there will Royal Power and Dignity (as Kings were to oppose those Unitarians who think installed in their Office, by anointing with him to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, Oyl, among the Jews) which is an Extre'me he be not the on'y Supreme God; nor application of his God-head or Dominion; can any with reason attempt to prove him. And this is said to be above all his Fellowes, to be reck, from his Works and Office as not sure above the Father and Holy Spirit, King of his Church, since 'tis implied that (which only are pretended to be his Fellows, is such, he must do His Image to God the as God, by them who understand it of the Father, in delivering up his Kingdom to him; Supreme God head) but above all other Subjects and his very expression to God the Father, ordinary Beings; This is one plain Scripture makes it plain, that there is no God the Son, Account of his being called God, for the same in the same Sense, or in the same Supreme. Things are spoken to him, and of him, un-Essence with the Father, because if there der the Character of God. O God. Thy were, then he ought not to be excluded Throne, &c. v. 8. I think men shou'd be from this Glory of having such open Honour well assured on what Grounds they go, being paid to him, (which is here ap-foie they assign other reasons of this Char- propriated to the Father only; and since rather, to different from the Scripture Ac- the Apostle speaks of the same God, (whom count: Let it suffice us, that God hath he explains to be the Father) to the end made him both Lord and Christ, Acts 2. 36. of this Discourse, and lays he shall be all that he has exalted him to be a Prince and inwall: How evidently do's he shew him to Saviour. Ch. 5. 31. be far beyond all that are not God the Fa-

However, our Adversaries will gain nothing by alledging Texts to prove the Title of God, to be given to Christ since that may be, and yet it will not prove him to be the Supream independent God; but only one who is inhabited of, and Commissioned and enabled by him who is so. As to that place, *Philip. 2. 6.* which is Corruptly rendered in our Translation; *he thought it no Robbery to be equal to God:* It is confess'd by aduersaries themselves, that it shou'd be read thus, viz. that he did not *assume*, or *Arrogate*, or *Snatch at*, or *Covet* an equality with God; the Words are never known to be used in any other Sense, as is shown by Doctor *Tillotson* in his Discourses against the *Socinians*; also by Dr. *Whitby* in his Exposition on the place, and others. So that this rather denies than asserts Christ's equality to God, tho' still he was in the *Form of God*, as that Notes the outward Resemblance of him in his mighty Power and Works, &c. which is the constant meaning of the word *form* in the New Testament.

But because some think such Perfections are in Scripture ascribed to Christ, as will prove him to be God in the highest Sense, I proceed to shew;

Thirdly, That our Blessed Lord Jesus Disclaims those Infinite perfections which belong only to the Supream *God of Gods*. And 'tis most certain, that if he want one, or any of these Perfections that are Essential to the Deity; He is not God in the Chief Sense: And if we find him Disclaiming the *One*, he cannot challenge the *Other*; for to deny Himself to have all Divine Perfections; or to deny Himself to be the Infinite God, is the same Thing: Let us observe some Instances for the Proof of this Point.

1. One Great and Peculiar Perfection of the Deity, is Absolute, underived Omnipotence: He who cannot Work all Miracles, and do whatever he List of Himself, without help from A-

nother, can never be the Supream Being, or God; Because he appears to be an *Inperfect, Defective Being, Comparatively*, since he needs help, and can Receive additional Strength from Another than Himself.

Now, it is most evident, that our Lord Jesus (whatever Power he had) Confesses again and again, that he had not Infinite Power of Himself, *John 5. 30.* *Of my Self I can do nothing.* He had been Speaking of great Miracles, viz. Raising the Dead, and Executing all Judgment; but all along takes Care, Men shou'd know that His *Sufficiency* for these Things was of God the Father. In the begining of the Discourse, v. 19. *the Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father do:* So in the Middle. v. 26, 27. *the Father has given to the Son to have life in Himself;* and as if he cou'd never too much Inculcate this great Truth, he adds towards the Conclusion; *I can do nothing of my Self ἀπ' ἑαυτοῦ*, or from nothing that is my Self do I draw this Power and Authority. Sure this is not the *Voice of God*, but of a Man! For the most High can Receive from none; he cannot be made more Mighty or Wise, &c. because to Absolute Perfection can be no Addition, *Rom. 11. 35.* And since Power in God, is an Essential Perfection; it follows, that if it be derived, Then so is the Essence or Being it Self, which is Blasphemy against the Most High, for 'tis to Ungod Him; to Number Him among Poor Dependent Derivative Beings; Whil't the Supream God indeed, is only he who is the *First Cause*, and Absolute Original of all.

Nay further, Our Lord considers Himself here, in Opposition to his *Father*; who he says, gave him all Power: Now if he had such an *Eternal Divine Word*, United more nearly to Him than the *Father*; Surely he wou'd have owned his Power to be from that *Word or Divine Son.*

How comes he to Ascribe nothing to that, since 'tis supposed to be equal in Power to the Father Himself, and more nearly Allyed to Jesus Christ, as the Operating Principal in Him? So *John 14.10.* *My Father in me does the Works;* by which, 'tis evident there was no Divine Agent in and with Him, but the Father; He only has all Power of Himself, and needs no Assistance.

2. Another Infinite Perfection; that must needs be in the Deity, is Supream Absolute Goodness: *All Nations have consented to this by the Light of Nature;* that *T'ayaber,* & *Optimus Maximus,* are the Prime Characters of the *Supream* as the Orator says, he is *One;* *quô nec Melius, nec Majus concipi Potest:* The Fullest, and Highest of all that are called *Good;* For indeed all other Good is derived from Him.

Now the Lord Jesus expressly Disclaims this Character, *Mat. 19. 17.* Jesus said to him, *Why callest thou me Good? there is none Good but one, that is God;* where 'tis most evident that he distinguishes Himself from God, as not the same with Him, and denies of Himself, what he affirms of God: And as to that Divine Perfection of *Supream Infinite Goodness;* He Challenges the Man for presuming to say what seemed to Attribute it to Him, and leads Him off to Another; who, and who only was more Eminently so.

'Tis astonishing to see what Violence is Offered to the Sacred Text, by such as Mantain the Equality of Jesus Christ to God His Father: What a strange fetch is it to suppose our Lords Meaning to be This? *qu. d. I know Man, thou dost not take Me for God as I am; Why then dost thou give Me the Title belonging to Him only?* when there is not one Word in the Context looking this Way; For Christ never Challenges the Poor Man, with this, that he thought too meanly of him (as they suppose) but quite contrary, that he

Thought or Spake too *highly* of Him; And verily if the Mans Error lay in this, that he thought too meanly of Christ, whilst His words otherwise were justly enough applyed to Him: I cannot think our Lord would have rebuked Him in that Manner; for instead of keeping him still to the right Object, and rectifying His apprehensions about it, which only were wrong, He seems clearly to carry Him off to another from *Himself*, as not the right Object, without rectifying His Thoughts of Christ at all; and to what End cou'd Christ Reprove Him in such away, as never tells Him what was his Fault, rather tempts Him to run into another, and leads Him out of the Way.

It shou'd seem rather (if any such notion had been then conceived by any,) that the Man did think Him to be God; for if he thought Him to be the *Supream Good*, that was to make Him *God* in His eye; and if He did not intend so much, but only meant it of an *Inferior Good*, how cou'd Christ rebuke Him for it, since that was no Fault or Error? And truly they who say Christs Receiving *Worship*, when on Earth, proves His Deity, can hardly give an Account why the Man should give, or Christ Receive *Worship* from Him, as He did, *Mark 10. 17.* if he did not take him for God? However, whatsoever the Man thought, he says what Jesus Christ *thought*, was only proper to be said of God, and too much to be said of Himself, as the Obvious Sense of His Words declares.

And let me add, that if our Lord Jesus had on purpose left the Matter Disguised, not willing to discover who he was then; yet 'tis strange that the Evangelists who many Years after relate the Matter, when it was *Necessary* to have it believed, that Christ was *Supream God* (as is pretended) that they *I say*, shou'd not unriddle the Matter, by inserting some Cautious Clause, as that this He said to prove him,

him, or because he knew he denied His God-head, or the like; For sometimes on less Occasions they enter such *Cautions*, John 6. 6. Ch. 21. 23. And yet tho' Three of the Evangelists relate this Discourse, they all do it the same way, and not one of them Says a tittle to direct us to this Secret way of Interpretation, but leaves us to the hazard of a most Fatal mistake (even Recommended to us by this History;) if Jesus Christ were indeed the Supream Good in as High a Sense as God His Father, which he so apparently here denies, and by that he denies Himself to be the most High God:

3. I will only add one perfection more, viz. *Absolute Omnipotence* or unlimited Knowledge of all Things, Past, Present, and to come, Ps. 147. 5. *His understanding is Infinite.* So Isa. 41. 23. Acts 15. 18. known to God are all His works from the Beginning.

Now, 'tis plain our Lord Jesus Christ had not this Infinite Knowledge, Particularly not of future Things, such as of the day of Judgment, Mark 13. 32. Says he, of *that Day knows no Man, no, not the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only.* Here the *Son* professes His knowledge to be *limited*, and Inferior to the Fathers, i.e. the *Son* of the *Father*, or *Son of God*; the *Son as above* Angels in Knowledge, the *Son* in the most *Eminent* Sense: Now how is it possible the *Son* can be God Infinite, and yet have but a finite understanding? or can he be Equal in Knowledge to the *Father*, and yet not know as much as the *Father*? And be sure if he was not an Infinite God, when on Earth, he cannot be such afterwards: Thus we have seen Christ Himself, with His own mouth *Disclaiming Infinite Original Power, Goodness and Knowledge* to belong to Him, but attributes them to His *Father only* as another, distinct from Himself, from whom he derived of each in a dependent limited Manner.

What can be said against these plain Arguments? I imagine our Opposers have but one Shift left for the evading them, and that is a distinction which serves 'em in all Cases; for they say, Jesus Christ speaks these Things of Himself, as *Man only*, while he had another Nature as *God*, which he Reserved, and Excepted out of the Case; So that when he lays, *I cannot do thus my Self, or I am not to be called the Chief Good, or do not know this, &c.* according to *them*, the meaning is qu. d I have not these perfections in my *humane Nature*, but yet I know, and can do all unassisted, and am the Chief Good in My Divine Nature, which also is more properly my Self: The Vanity of which Subterfuge I intend now to lay open, by shewing how Absurdly this Distinction of the two Natures is pretended, to take off the Force of such Expressions from Christs own Mouth, which in their Natural and Undisguised appearance, do proclaim His Inferiority to God, even the Father, and I shall Dwell the more upon this, because 'tis the most Popular and Common Evasion, and comes in at every turn, when all other relief fails.

It wou'd be no unreasonable Demand, to ask, what Intimation of any such Distinction of two Natures they can point us to, in any of these Discourses of Christ? Why shou'd Men Devise or Imagine for Him, such a Strange, and seemingly Deceitful way of Speaking, from no Ground, nor Necessity, other than that of upholding their own precarious Opinion? But I have several Remarks to make upon this common Answer.

That which in the First place I have to Object against it is; That our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ, if *Himself* was the Supream God in any Nature of His own, Cou'd not have said such Things, (as I conceive) in any Consistency, with Truth and Sincerity; (which

(which he always maintained, strictly) he cou'd not say Himself cou'd not do; or did not know the Thing, which all this while *Himself* cou'd do, and did know very well, as before if he was the Supream God, he cou'd and did, for this were to make Him say what is most False, and to *Equivocate* in the most deceitful manner; for tho' we shou'd suppose he consisted of two Infinitely distant Natures, and so had two Capacities of Knowledge, &c. Yet since *Himself* includes them both, it follows, that the denying a Thing of *Himself* in absolute Terms, without any Limitation in the Words, or other obvious *Circumstances*, does plainly imply a denial of its belonging to any part of His Person, or to any Nature in it; For tho' we may affirm a Thing of a Person, which belongs only to a part of him; as I may properly say a Man is wounded or hurt, tho' it be only in one Member, suppose an Arm; Yet I cannot justly deny a Thing of him which belongs only to one part, because it belongs not to another; as I cannot say a Man is not wounded, because tho' one Arm be Shot or Wounded, yet the other is whole.

For instance, I have two Organs of sight, two Eyes; Now suppose I converse with a Man with one Eye *shut* and the other *open*; if being asked whether I saw him, I shou'd dare to say I saw him not (without any limitation) meaning to my self, that I saw to know them, meaning it, as Man. But him not with the Eye which was shut, says the Doctor this is absur'd; because tho' still I saw him well enough with the Eye which was open; I fear I shou'd bear as to say he doth not any way know the reproach of a Lyar and *Deceiver*, notwithstanding such a mental Reservation as the *Papists*, as no doubt it is; Then sure some wou'd attribute to the *Holy Jesus*. For knowledge is the Eye of the Person, Jesus Christ is supposed to have two of these knowing Capacities; the *one* weak, the *other* strong and peircing that discerns all Things; now as such an one, the Disciples repair to Him, and ask Him, when the end of the World and time of His

coming shall be? *Mat. 24. 3*. He answers them, by giving them some General Account of the Matter, but says that the particular *Day and Hour* he knew not, nor did any know but the Father, meaning, (say my opposers) that he knew it not with his *Humane* knowledge, tho' he knew it well enough with His *Divine*, at the same time, that he said, *the Son knows it not*, absolutely and indefinitely.

And yet if Jesus Christ had a *Divine* Knowledge and Nature, no doubt his Disciples (who, if any Body must be supposed to believe it) directed the question to that, rather than to the imperfect humane capacity; and yet in answer to it, he says, he knew not the day, which wou'd not be counted Sincerity, or Truth in Men, much less was Jesus Christ in danger of it, in His mouth no *Guile was*; let us not impute it to Him.

That you may see this is fair reasoning, hear how some of the other side own it, when out of the heat of this controversy. See Doctor Stillingfleets Sermon, on *Mat. 10. 16*. speaking of the *Equivocations* of Popish Priests, whose common Answer,

when Examined about what they have known by Confession, is that they know it not, which they think to vindicate from the charge of Lying; by saying, that in Confession, the Priest knows Matters as God, not as Man, and therefore he denies to know them, meaning it, as Man. But Now if this be a good answer against the *Papists*, as no doubt it is; Then sure 'tis so in the present Case: Therefore when Christ says, he knows not the Day of Judginent; 'tis as much as to say he does not any way know it; and consequently, 'tis a vain Shift to say, it was as Man only; we must beware least we bring the *Holy Jesus* under such reproach for Equivocation, as the Romish Priests lye under;

and

and make the *Jesuits* themselves think they have a good Title to that *Name*, by imitating herein, his own Example; which in this very *instance* they alledge with so great Advantage according to this Interpretation.

2. As a further Evidence, That Jesus Christ intended no such Distinction of two Natures, as is pretended; 'tis to be observed, that he puts not the *distinction*, or opposition between the Son of *Man*, and the Eternal *Word* (as some speak) but be-

tween the Son and his *Father*, *Mark* 13. 32. *Not the Son knows, but only the Father;*

by which 'tis plain, He had no thought of including any Person or Nature of his own among the excepted: For whatever was not the *Father*, he says, was ignorant of that Day; now 'tis certain, that in no *Nature* was the Son the *Father*; and consequently where *None* but the *Father* knows, none who is *not* the *Father*, can be intend-

ed; and since our Lord was making an exception in the Case, he wou'd not have forgotten to except the Eternal *Word* too,

if there had been such a Divine principle

in himself, *equal* to the *Father* and distinct from him; for 'tis a known *Rule*, that an exception from a general Assertion, con-

firms it as to other instances not excepted.

Will they say, That by the *Father* is meant all Three Persons here? *Viz.* Father, Son and Holy Ghost: What! can the *Father* as opposed to the Son, be put for the Father and the Son? What woful work will this make with Scripture, to suppose that what are *Opposed* to each other, do include each other, under the very Characters by which they are opposed? As well may they say; that in the Baptismal Form, by the *Father* is meant, Father, Son, and Spirit, tho' he be distinguished from the other two; and I shou'd despair of ever understanding the Scriptures above all Books that ever were written, at this Rate

of Interpretation: No doubt therefore, but the *Father* as opposed to the Son, ex-

cludes all that is the Son; and then there cou'd be no Son of God that knew of that Day which only the *Father* knew of, and consequently no Son that is God *equal* to the *Father*.

3. Moreover, That Interpretation must needs be unjust, which if admitted, will make all, even the most plain Speech *uncertain*, and utterly insignificant: as this interpretation of Christ's words wou'd do: For as I ask the *Patrons* of this Opinion, in what words Jesus Christ cou'd *in Brief* have denied himself to be God most High, if he had a mind to do it, more plain and full than these? In which he says, he knew not all things as the *Father* did, nor cou'd do all things, &c. So I wou'd fain have them shew me, what words of that Nature he cou'd have used, which the *same* way of interpretation, as they here use, will not *evade* and make insignificant. For had he said, or *Sworn* in plain words thus, *Viz. I tell you I am not the Supream God;* and none but my *Father* has that Glory. They wou'd upon the *same Reason* still have said, This was to be understood of him as *Man* only: So that no word's professing himself *not* to be God, cou'd be a proof exception from a general Assertion, con-

firms it, if this way of interpretation be Allowed: So that I may safely say thus much, that the Blessed Jesus has declared himself not to be the Supream God, nor equal to the *Father*, as plainly as words cou'd speak, or in brief, express: And that this Declaration made by him already is not to be evaded, any *other way*, that what will make it impossible his mind shou'd be understood by any words he cou'd have de-

signedly used in the matter: Let any one try if this do not hold True; and sure it must be an absur'd way of interpretation which leaves a *Man* no Opportunity, or Power of speaking his Meaning *plainly*, so as to be understood.

4. Again, This way of interpretation, which the Advocates of the Opinion I oppose, are so much necessitated to, for upholding their

their Cause,' does plainly overthrow it a-
gain, and may be turned against them-
selves; for if it be just and true to deny of
Christ absolutely what belongs to him in
one Nature, because there is another Na-
ture in which it belongs not to him; then,
since to be the chief God belongs to him
(according to our Adversaries) only in one
Nature, and not in respect of the other, or
humane Nature, it follows that it may
as justly be said Jesus Christ is not God,
nor to be *Worshiped* or Trusted as such;
Nay, That he was not before the *Virgin
Mary*; according to them and the like;
and this without adding any limitation or
restriction, any more than our Lord does
in the place mentioned.

What would they say to one who shou'd
speak or preach so, *That Jesus is not God*,
that he cannot do all things, nor is equal
to the Father; &c. Wou'd they not con-
clude he was a Denyer of the Deity of
Christ? else he wou'd never speak so un-
guarded: upon the *same Account*, when
Jesus Christ himself says it; that he can-
not of *himself* do all things, nor knows all
things, and makes no reserves in his words,
we may conclude he also *denies* his being
Supream God; else, if it be a just way of
speaking in him, it cannot be unjust in us
to imitate him, by denying him indefinite-
ly, to be, what he in anyone Nature is not,
i.e. that he is *not God*, without adding
more.

Nay, After this way of Speaking which
they Attribute to Christ, a Man may be
Taught to say his *Creed Backward*, and
yet make a true profession of his Faith, by
denying of Jesus Christ in absolute Ex-
pressions, what ever may be denied of one
of his Natures; thus since the *Apostles Creed*
takes Notice of nothing to be believed con-
cerning Christ, but what belongs to his
Mankind (which is very strange, if there
were any Articles relating to his Divinity,
which must needs be most important) one
may venture to deny their all; with this

secret unexpressed Reserve, Viz: Meaning
it of the Divine Nature (to which they be-
long not) So that one may say, I believe
not that Jesus Christ was Conceived of the
Holy Ghost, or *Born* of the Virgin *Mary*;
I believe that he never was Crucified under
Pontius Pilate, nor was Dead or Buried;
that he never *Rose* nor *Ascended*, nor will
Return visibly again; for his Divine Nature
(which 'tis pretended he had) was not ca-
pable of these Things; and since they say,
the Personality is Divine, here seems more
warrant to be bolder in denying indefinite-
ly of the person what belongs not to the
Divine Nature, whose the Personality is,
than in so denying, of the person what on-
ly belongs not to the humane Nature; as
this interpretation makes Christ to do.

5. Finally, it weighs something with
me, in opposition to this way of interpre-
tation, that the Evangelists never take any
occasion (when they had so many) to sub-
joyn any *Caution* against taking Christ's
words in their obvious Sense, when he says,
He did not know the Hour, &c. and the
like. If as we said, our Lord had no mind
to reveal his Divinity (tho' I see not still
why he shou'd deny it thus) yet *sure* his
Apostles who wrote so many Years after,
whom it concerned to Reveal all impor-
tant Truths most clearly, wou'd not fail to
have set the Reader Right, by removing
such obvious Objections as these are against
the Supream Deity of Christ; and saying,
he spake this only in respect of his *Man-
hood*, that he knew not all things, &c.
But here is not one Caution given, as of-
ten we find there was about less Matters,
John 2. 21. ch. 11. 13. No doubt it was,
because they wou'd have the thing under-
stood as it fairly lies, not thinking of any
such secret Reserve in Christ, of a *Divine
Nature* in his Person, to be tacitly except-
ed, when he had denied such professions
of his Person indefinitely.

Thus it remains Good, that Jesus Christ
disclaims infinite perfections, to belong to
him

him as to the Father; and therefore that he is not the same infinite God with him, if we can believe his own Words: But before I conclude this Argument, I shall endeavour to Answer what our Opposers offer on the *contrary* side: They say there is abundant Evidence from other Scriptures, that Jesus Christ has those perfections in him, which I have shewed in the forementioned places, he denies of himself; these they lay in *Ballance* to the other, and since both sides cannot be proved, it must be examined, which ought to yield? Particularly they say *Omniscience* is ascribed to Jesus Christ, even such as is peculiar to the Supream God, and since this indeed is that infinite perfection which they seem to alledge the most plausible Testimonies for its belonging to him, therefore I chuse to single out this in particular: I think I have made good the *Negative* already from his own Mouth, that he did not know all things: Nor can any thing of equal Evidence and Force be produced for the *Affirmative*, as will appear upon considerate Examination.

The instances usually alledged to prove the infinite *Omniscience* of Jesus Christ are either; 1. Such as speak of his knowing *all* things in General; or, 2. Of his knowing Mens Thoughts and *Hearts* in particular: To both which I Reply.

First, 'Tis Objected, that the Disciples ascribe to him the Knowledge of all things, as *John* 16. 30. ch. 21. 17. *Thou knowest all things*: *I Answer*; That as those Expressions are words of Admiration from the Disciples *not yet inspired*: So they are intended only to express a very great and comprehensive Knowledge far from infinite, Divine *Omniscience*, as appears.

1. By Christ's own words he knew not what the Father knew, *viz.* The time of the *Day of Judgment*.

2. In that it was common to ascribe *all* knowledge to Men of extraordinary Wisdom, especially when any intended to

commend them highly, and were affected with wonder; for Admiration and Praise naturally inclines to run out into *Hyperboles*; thus the Woman of *Tekoah* under a surprising wonder of *David's Sagacity* cries out: *My Lord knows all things on Earth, and is as Wise as an Angel*, *2 Sam. 14. 20.* and the Apostle in commendation of some Christians says, *They knew all Things*, *1 John 2. 20. and 27.* and yet 'tis plain such *Encomiums* must have their limitations; and indeed the Jews seem to have thought that their Prophets knew, in a manner, *all Things*, Thus *Luke 7. 39.* When a woman of ill Fame Anointed our *Lords Head*; the *Pharisee* says of him, *If this Man were a Prophet, he would know what manner of Woman this is*: And when the woman of *Samaria* found that he told her of *all* her secret Acts that ever she did, she concludes thus, *Sir I perceive thou art a Prophet*, *John 4. 19.* 'Tis no wonder then if the Disciples speak thus of him, thou knowest *all* things, without esteeming him more than the greatest of Prophets.

3. 'Tis evident they never intended more, by attributing *all knowledge* to him, from their *own* words in one of the Texts mentioned, *John 16. 30.* Where the Disciples tell us, how much they inferred from his Great Knowledge (which they describe and extol, by saying, *Thou knowest all things*) not that he was *God*, but one *sent* of God, *by this we believe that thou cameſt forth from God*: Not that thou thy self art that God. So that by these large expressions, they only intend to Attribute to him what a created Being is, by Divine Assistance, capable of; and therefore 'tis Violence to their words, to infer from them, that Jesus Christ is *God*, when themselves infer no such thing; who best knew their own meaning.

And yet if it were Granted that our Lord Jesus knows all things, *i. e.* which *actually* are; yet if he knows not all *Futurities* too; which himself Denies, he comes short of infinite

Infinite Omnipotence. For ought I know, a finite Being may have a Knowledge commensurate to this poor Earth, which is but a *dust of the Balance*; and yet not know all Gods secret Purposes, or the Seasons which the Father keeps in his own Hand, *Act. i. 7.*

2. *Tis Objected*, That the knowledge of the Heart is ascribed to Christ, *John 2.25. Mat. 9.9.* But especially, *Rev. 2.23.* and this they say is what belongs to God only, as *Solomon* judges, *1 Kin. 8.39.* and God claims it as his eminent Glory, *Jer. 17.10.* and yet *Jesus Christ* says, *I am he who searches the Heart*; therefore say they, surely he must be that God, *Who only knows the Hearts of all the Children of men.* I take this to be the strongest instance that can be produced from the Sacred Text, for proving any infinite Divine Perfections to belong to the Lord Jesus Christ, and it shall be seriously considered.

In Answer hereto, I shall shew *Two* things. 1. In what Sense, the searching and knowing the Heart is made *peculiar* to God, and *incommunicable* to others; by those Texts: 2. That notwithstanding it be peculiar to him in *some* Sense, yet these *Acts* may in another Sense be justly Attributed to another, and perform'd by him who is not the Most High God.

1. As to the former, tho' *Solomon* say, *Thou Lord only knowest the Hearts of all Men.* Yet what if I say, 'tis no wonder that *Solomon* shou'd not know of any other to whom that Excellency was Communicated. since this *Mystery* of the Unsearchable Riches and Fulness of Christ, and of Gods being *manifest* in his Flesh, and his High Exaltation of him, was hidden in the Ages past, and only manifested in the times of the Gospel; for 'tis in these latter times that our Lord Jesus has obtained his great Authority and Dignity, for which he has Received answerable Abilities: Yet I add, such Expressions in Scripture, appropriating some perfections to God, do only im-

port that God has *no equal* herein, or that there is an *Eminent Sense* only in which such perfections are peculiar to *God*, and incommunicable to all others; tho' still in a *Lower Sense* something of them may be Communicated by him to others; and this shall be seen, to be no forced Supposition, but according to the current strain of plain Scripture, in a multitude of instances. Thus 'tis said, *That God only is Wise, Rom. 16. 27. 1 Tim. 1. 17.* So *Ch. 6. 16.* *God only has Immortality.* So *Thou only art Holy, Rev. 15. 4.* and yet there are Wise and Holy Men, and immortal Holy Angels and Spirits; but the meaning of those appropriate Expressions is, that the Blessed God is Wise, and Holy, and Immortal, in a more *Excellent* way and higher Sense than all others, and in which Sense others cannot be so, so when 'tis said God *only* knows the hearts of Men, it must be interpreted the same way, *Viz.* That there is none can know the Heart as God does, so Universally, so immediately and independently: And yet 'tis no contradiction, to say that he enables another to do it, in great measure, under him; and as he wou'd Argue but very weakly who shou'd go about to prove an Angel to be God, from this that he is called *Holy* and *Wise*, &c. which are said to belong to God only: *Even* so in the same manner must they Argue who wou'd prove Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God, from his knowing Mens Hearts, because 'tis said to belong to God only; except they can shew that Jesus Christ knows in the same excellent independent manner and degree as his Father, and that he is no more beholden to him for Ability and Assistance than he is to his Son *Jesus Christ*. So I might Argue from *Isa. 46. 9.* That God only knows *Futurities*, and yet how often have the Prophets foretold them And 'tis not hard to suppose that as Holiness and Wisdom, so to know the thoughts and Hearts of Men, hath been Communicated

cated to Prophets and Apostles; was there not something of this, if not in the Prophet *Elishas*, telling the secret Counsels of the *Syrian King*, 2 Kings 6. 12. yet at least in the *Spirit of Discerning* mentioned 1 Cor. 12. 10. and in the case of *Ananias and Saphira*? *Acts 5.* I grant this was by Divine assistance of the Spirit of God, and by Revelation: Neither is our Lord *Jesus Christ* ashamed to own that His knowledge is sometimes owing to *Revelation from God His Father*, Rev. 1. 1. If any shou'd ask, how *Jesus Christ* comes to know all that he Reveals in those Seven Epistles to the Seven Churches, &c. The very First Words of that Book of the Revelations, may be an answer, *It was the Revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ, &c.* No wonder then that he says, he knows their Works, their Hearts, and their approaching Judgments and Tryals, when His own vast Abilities are assisted by God's Revelation.

But it will be said, that His *searching the Heart*, Imports it to be His own Act. *Answer;* So it may very well be; for whatever a Man knows, he knows it by his own Act; And why may not the *Mind* search, and yet be under the light of Revelation, and the Influence of Superior assistance? But yet after all, these Words of searching the Heart, are only an expression that denotes the *Accuracy* of His Knowledge, not the *Manner* of attaining to it, for taken *properly*, as applyed to God, 'tis dishonourable to say, he is put to make a *search*, since all things are naked and open to His view. And if they must be taken *Strictly* and *Properly*, as applyed to Christ, then they belong not to Him in the *same* Sence as they do to God, and so can be no Argument of His being that God, which leads me to shew:

Secondly, That theres no absurdity in attributing *this* Knowledge of the Heart to *Jesus Christ*, tho' He be not the Most High God. That he knows things with some limitation as to the *Degree*, and in

dependence on His Father, as to the *Manner*, appears by what has been said already: And therefore the knowledge of the heart attributed to Him, must be such as is consistent with His Subordination to the Fathers greater Knowledge.

'Tis pleaded, That 'tis not possible for a *Finite* Being to have such Universal knowledge of the hearts and ways of Men, as is ascribed to *Jesus Christ*, and which as *Head* and Ruler of the Church, and World, He ought to have, and therefore he is infinite God.

Answer, I am pretty sure, it can never be demonstrated, that it exceeds a Finite capacity to know the concerns of all on this Earth, when the enlarged understanding is assisted in the highest Manner by Divine influence and Revelation. The reason is, because the *Object* is Finite, and I challenge any Man to shew me how it can be impossible for a Finite capacity to Comprehend a Finite Object, as this World is, and wou'd be, tho' it were Ten thousand times greater than it is? I am Satisfy'd this can never be demonstrated to imply any contradiction in it; And that all such imaginations concerning it, Proceed Chiefly from too high a Conceit of Man, and too low apprehension of the infinite God; as if the distance between these two was so small, that there cou'd not be one made of a Capacity so much above Men, as to be Commensurate to them all, but presently he must be the most High God, as tho' that Supreme Being cou'd not produce one who shou'd be a Thousand times beyond all this Earth and its Inhabitants, and yet it be infinitely below Himself: Methinks, if the *Sun* was but an Intelligent Creature, and cou'd diffuse his Intellectual Influences as he do's his Natural; cou'd but see and understand with his Beams and secret Influences, 'Tis easy to imagine what a Penetrating and Comprehensive knowledge he might have, but we may Entertain much greater thoughts of the *Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ.* And

And I conceive a strong argument to prove Jesus Christ as Man, capable of such deep and extensive Knowledge, may be drawn from the Offices of Dignity and Power conferred on Him by God. For God has given to Him to be Head over all things, Eph. 1. 22. He has given or committed to Him all Judgment, John 5. 22. And that as the Son of Man, v. 27. in short, His Kingly Office by which he Rules over all the World, and takes special care of all His Members, as it Necessarily supposes His knowledge of the whole Estate of His Church and every Member of it, as far as is necessary for the Discharge of that Trust; So I think it undeniably proves this large Knowledge to be Exercised by Him as *Man*, however he gains it;

For, since this Office and Power is given, it cannot Terminate in the Divine Nature; for who can give to God, any Dignity or Power, who has all Originally in His own Being? it must then be given to the *Man*, or humane Nature only: And if the Man Christ Jesus sustain this Office, and be invested with this Kingly Power, even with all Power in Heaven and Earth, then as *Man* we cannot deny Him to be suitably qualifyed for it, with all requisite Abilities, lest we reproach God, as calling one to an Employment, who is not fitted for it, or *Himself* in assuming a trust which he is not able to discharge; besides, unless His humane Nature can execute this Power, it cannot be said to be given to it, for a Power which cannot be exerted, or is impossible to be executed, is not given nor Received, any more than a Commission, or Grant to a Stock or a Tree, to bear Rule, not over the other Trees (as in *Gotham's* Apologue) but over a Nation, or to Command an Army: 'Tis no Gift at all, if this were the case, that the *Man* Christ Jesus be utterly incapable of the Office and Government lodged in Him:

If it be said, That tho' the Office and delegated Authority be committed to the

humane, yet 'tis only executed by the Divine Nature in Christ. I Answer, 'Tis most unreasonable to suppose this *Trust* committed to the *Man* Christ, who must at last deliver it up, 1Cor. 15. 24. and yet the Management of it belong only to another Being: How can he be Commended for being *Faithful*, over the House of God, to *Him* who appointed or constituted *Him*, Heb. 3. 2. 6. when 'tis not expected he shou'd execute His Office? I Grant indeed that His *Kingly Office* is executed by the assistance of God, as he exerts His Divine Power and Wisdom, through the humane Nature of Christ, and Communicates of them in *all fulness* to Him, in whom it dwells; But to say, that the *Man* Christ does not Exercise His Kingly Universal Power, but that His Divine Nature (supposing it) does solely and immediately execute the Office given to Him as *Man* or Mediator, (for to God can nothing be given) is in my Mind a most Gross absurdity; for 'tis to say, That God Officiates for Man, in Execution of a *Delegated*, or Subordinate Authority; or that he Acts under the Authority, and in the Name of a Creature, which is not meet to be said of the Supreme God. It remains therefore, That as Christ's Universal Kingdom and Headship, is by Gift from God (of which only the *Man* Christ is the Receiver) committed as a *Trust* to Him; So he certainly wants no ability to execute that Trust in the *Nature* entrusted with it; I say no ability, whether of Power or Knowledge, sufficient to render Him, a careful, vigorous, and every way most Effectual *Head* of His Body, and Ruler of the World, and to deny this, is to Rob Him of His greatest Glory.

Besides, What Benefit or *Gift* is it to the *Man* Christ, that the Divine Nature shou'd execute a Power which it *always* had, and cou'd Exercise without any *Gift* to Him? What Reward, or what Addition was this to Him.

Another Argument may be drawn, from that Comfortable Ground of confidence in a Christians Address to God, which the both *Thomists* and *Scotists*, allow Him universal Knowledge, tho' they differ in their way of explaining it.

Scripture lays down, viz. The Sympathizing Compassion of our Lord Jesus Christ, towards His distressed Servants, arising from His own sufferings when on Earth, *Heb. 4. 15. 16.* Seeing we have not an High Priest, who cannot be touched with the feeling of our InfirmitieS, but was in all points Tempted as we are: Let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace. Christ's having been tryed with Sufferings, makes Him a more Compassionate earnest Advocate for us; and this is our Comfort

Now 'tis certain, This Compassion arising from His own experience of trouble, can belong to none but His humane Nature; the Divine Nature is Compassionate, but not for this reason, because it was Tempted, or grieved with Misery: No, it was only the Man Christ Suffered, and consequently feels a *Sympathy* from hence with His distressed Servants: And 'tis most certain, that if he Sympathize with them in their troubles, he must then know them in that *Nature*, which only has a fellow *feeling* of them, for none can Sympathize with the Miseries of others which he knows not of; So that they who deny Christ's humane Nature to be capable of the knowledge of all our Miseries, do in effect deny Him to be such a *Compassionate Advocate* as the Scripture represents Him, and Rob us of this Strong ground of Consolation and Hope in our approaches to God, which the *Apostle* wou'd have us to build on.

And this Doctrine has been so far from appearing, either impossible, or absurd to the reason of Mankind, that I might produce the consent of a very great Number of learned Men, even among them who oppose my other Opinions. The *Lutherans* allow the Man Christ a sort of universal knowledge, as well as universal Presence which they Plead for. The School-Men,

And there was a time in the Sixth Century, when in the Christian Church some were branded with *Heresie*, under the Name of *Agnoetæ*, who held Christ was ignorant of any thing, which I conceive must have been in relation to His *humane* Nature; for those Persons owned Him to have a *Divine Nature*, and 'tis hard to imagine they cou'd attribute Ignorance to that. But (waving that Matter which is disputed) it is enough for my purpose, viz. to prove what Sense the Christian Church then had of Christ's extensive Knowledge, as *Man*; that they who wrote against those *Hereticks*, do expressly deny any ignorance in Christ as *Man*; for this we may produce two famous *Patriarchs* of the Christian Church at that time, viz. *Eulogius* of *Alexandria*, and *Gregory* of *Rome*: Those Hereticks produced for their Opinion, Christ's Words, That he knew not the time of the last Judgment, as an instance of His ignorance: To this the *Former* Person says, that he was not ignorant of it, not as *Man*, and much less as *God*: The latter says, *In Natura quidem humanitatis novisse, sed non ex Natura humanitatis*. He knew it with the humane Nature, but that knowledge did not rise from the humanity; which is what I maintain as to the knowledge I attribute to him, but not extending it so far as to all *futurities*, which they did.

And I find not a few of the Modern *Reformed Divines*, (who when out of this Dispute) speak agreeably to this, and are far from thinking it Idolatry, to ascribe as much knowledge as I have done, to the *Man Christ*. Thus the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, in his notes on *Eph. 4. 16.* plainly intimates, that he conceives an *Angel* might be made capable of Ruling the *Universal* Church on Earth by Legislation, Judgment, and Execution: For having said this,

this Task was impossible to any Power but *Divine*; He corrects himself by a d-
ing, or *Angelical* at least; And sure the
Man Christ's Ability, is far Superior to
Angels; besides that he has them Ministring
to Him, and giving Him notice of Matters
if there be any Occasion; for he has Seven
Principal Spirits, who are the *Eyes of the*
Lamb sent forth through all the Earth, as
the same Author interprets, Rev. 5. 6.

So the Author of a little Book, called
the *Future State*, the same who wrote the
Good Samaritan, a worthy Divine of the
Church of *England*, says many things
very Rational concerning the large extent
of Christ's humane Knowledge; that prob-
ably, *He can as easily inspect the whole*
Globe of this Earth, and the Heavens that
encompass it, as we can view a Globe of an
Inch Diameter, P. 46. 47. that he intercedes
as *Man*, and can be intercede in a case which
he knows not? So again, P. 150. The like says
Limburch in his *Theol. Christ.* lib. 5. C. 18.

Let me add only the Testimony of Dr.
Thomas Goodwin, who was never I suppose
censured for an *Idolater* among *Dissenters*;
And yet 'tis scarce possible that I shou'd
attribute greater knowledge to the *Man*
Jesus Christ than he. See his *Select cases*,
part 3d, where he says, *The humane under-*
standing of Christ takes in all occurrences
which concerns His Church. And that as
he said all Power in Heaven and Earth is
given me of my Father, so might he say all
knowledge in Heaven and Earth is given
me, that his Beams pierce into every
corner, that he knows the Sore of every Heart,
and concludes with these remarkable words,
that as a *Looking-Glass wrought in the form*
of a Globe, represents the Images of all that
is in the Room: So the enlarged humane
understanding of Christ, takes in all things
in Heaven and Earth at once. It seems
these Men did not take it to be the Pe-
culiar Perfection of the Divine Nature to
know the Hearts; So as that no Creature
cou'd partake of it by Divine assistance and
Revelation.

Indeed, as to the manner of knowing
the heart; We cannot tell how the inhabi-
tants of the other World have access to
our minds or to each others, but without
doubt, *Jesus Christ*; whose eyes are as a
Flame of Fire, has more proper abilities
for penetration, as well as more Revelati-
on from God, and more Capacity, for
receiving and Treasuring it up, than all
others. In short, 'tis evident Christ as *Man*,
is the Great *Administrator* of Gods provi-
dential Kingdom, John 5. 27. As *Man*, he
must Judge the whole World, Acts 17. 31.
which implies vast and universal Knowledge:
Who then dares say, that the *Man Christ*
Jesus, has not a Knowledge as large as this
narrow Earth, or as the *Sand by the Sea*
shore, without any *Hyperbole*? I think 'tis
beyond all reasonable doubt, and as this
Doctrine has appeared Rational enough,
and escaped all Censure, as far as I know,
when delivered by others than the *Unita-*
rians: So I hope it must not be counted
Heretical in them, for which others never
Forfeited the Glorious Title of *Orthodox*.

Thus it appears, That all which is said
of Christ's extensive Knowledge in Scrip-
ture, is far from proving Him to be the
Supreme *Infinite God*, it may be Accounted
for otherwise very fairly; And the like
may be also said with respect to other
(which some call) *Divine perfections* attri-
buted to Him, that they are no more
truly infinite, as attributed to Him, than
this of Knowledge, but that there are plain
evidences of their being attributed to Him
in a limited, and inferior Sense, in com-
parison of what they are, in the most
Glorious *God over all Gods*; and therefore
Men had need produce other sort of Ar-
guments for the Supreme *Deity* of Christ,
than from these Topicks.

Nor do I doubt but I cou'd maintain my
cause with equal advantage, upon the
Head of *Divine worship*, which is another
Topick, whence my opposers wou'd infer
the *Deity* of the Lord Jesus Christ; it
were

were easy to shew, there is no *Instance* of I must have one who is *supreme God*, and supreme Divine Worship given *ultimately Man*, for my Mediator with God, then to him in Scripture, but on the *contrary*, when I address to Jesus Christ as the such all the Honour it assigns to him, is preme God, where is the *God-man* that such as speaks him to be inferior to the Fa- must be my Mediator with him? To say ther, and dependent on him; since it is he Mediates with *himself*, is the same as to wholly grounded upon what God his Fa- say, that I must go to him without a Me- ther has graciously *blessed* on him: Thus diator, and turns the whole Business of he requires *Baptism* (if that be an act of Mediation into a *Metaphor*, contrary to the immediate proper Worship) in his *Name*, common sense of things, as well as against because *all power* in Heaven and Earth was the *Scripture*; and I wou'd gladly know given to him. Thus we must honour the what is the notion of going to God with- Son as (truly not as greatly as) we honour out a Mediator, If this be all, that he me- the *Father*, because the *Father* hath com- diates with himself? Who ever doubted mitted, or given, *all judgment* to him, Joh. the exercise of his own *Wisdom or Mercy*, 5. 22, 23. Thus at the *Name* of Jesus must that these do in a sort plead in him? But every *Knee bow*, and every *Tongue* confess sure the Scriptures speak of a Mediator with- him to be *Lord*; because as a reward of out him, when they set forth Jesus Christ his Obedience the *Father* hath given him as such; and who is this Mediator, when *Name above every Name*: And 'tis added, we go to Jesus Christ as the *ultimate Object*? that all this Homage is ultimately to the If it be said *his Humane Nature only*, acts *Glory of the Father*. Worship which is thus in this Mediation, tho' as united to the Di- grounded upon *derived* and borrowed Ex- vine; I answer, That as this is still to make cellency, is not supremely Divine, and can- Christ Mediator with himself; so the Hu- not be offered to the Infinite Self-originate, Man, or *Humane Nature alone*, be capable Independent *Deity*, without a great Af- front, because 'tis not the most excellent, of doing the part of a Mediator, then 'tis *Mal. 1. 14.* to praise an independent God, for Honour and Power granted to him by another, supposes a *Falshood*, and mingles Reproaches with Praise.

So that however there may be the same common *external Acts*, or Words; (such as bowing the Knee, and saying *Glory and Praise, &c.*) used to God and the *Mediator*; as also in some Instances, they are given in common to *ordinary Men*, yet the Mind of a rational Worshiper, will make a *cafe*; than his *Body* or *Humane Under-Distinction* in his inward *Intention*, as no *standing* are infinite, because so united to doubt but those devout Jews did, who in an *Infinite Nature*.
the same act, *bowed their Heads, and wor- shipped both God and the King*, 1 Chron. 29. 20. but I shall not pursue this any farther at present

Moreover, I judge, that to assert Jesus Christ to be the *supreme God*, subverts the Gospel-Doctrine of his *Mediation*; for if knowledge of the secret, mental Prayers, the

inward Desires and Distresses of all Christians and Dissenters, one part holding three Christians, or to know any ones Heart; And real Persons, or infinite Beings, the other how then can he be a compassionate Interbutone ((for they are not yet agreed whether in cases that he knows nothing of? er they worship three infinite supreme Beings. Or how can he have a fellow-feeling of their ings or but One) so between them both, these Sufferings, which he knows not that they two great Doctrines are subverted, the Reason feel at all? What comfort is there in this alists leave room for a Mediator in the account of Christ's Mediation? The Divine Godhead; but they destroy the Unity of Nature is precluded from it, because they God, who is one Infinite Being; on the o- direct us to seek to that as the ultimate ther hand, they who hold true to the Di- Object thro' a Mediator; and the Humane vine Unity, or one infinite Being under Nature, they say, may know nothing of three modes, or Properties, or Relations, our case, nor knows our Hearts, whether we do by plain consequence leave no place Worship sincerely, or Repent sincerely, or for such a Mediator as they require, viz. hypocritically only; and so knows not how One who is an infinite God, to be Media- to represent, or recommend us to God: tor with the infinite God; when there What a case now do these Men bring us in- is no other infinite Being but his own, and to? There is no Mediator left, to inter- he cannot be thought to intercede with pose with the supreme God, so that we himself neither: So that to keep the Gos- must deal with him immediately and alone, pel Faith whole and undefiled, 'tis neces- which they will own is far from the Gos- fary that we avoid both these Rocks, by pel Doctrine or Method. Thus is the Ld. believing God and his Christ to be Two Be- Jesus turn'd out of his Office, on a pretence ings, that so there may be room for One of giving him higher honour: So that up- to Mediate with the Other: And that these on the whole, as far as I see, we had even Two are not two equal or supreme Beings, as good be content with the Apostles fair but one subordinate to the other, that so we and plain account of this matter; if its be- may preserve the Unity of the supreme God. ing so very intelligible, may not be an un- Let us then bethink our selves seriously, pardonable Objection against it, viz. That not what the Church in latter Days has there is but one God, and one Mediator be- thought of Jesus Christ; but what his own tween God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, Apostles, when inspired, have thought of 1 Tim. 2. 5. Never let us fear, but Paul him: Methinks none was more likely, or knew how to describe the Mediator, with- ever had a fairer Occasion to represent his out leaving out the better half of him, or Lord in the height of his Glory, than the A- the principal Nature: Our Mediator, ac- postle Peter, in the Day of Pentecost! cording to him, was only a Man; who That Day of Triumph, with the newly also is by Office a God, or Ruler over all; and visibly inspired Apostles: Hear how made so by him who puts all things under magnificently he describes his glorious Lord him. Jesus before his Murtherers, Acts 2. 22. Ye

And indeed as there are two princi- men of Israel hear these words, Jesus of Na- pal distinguishing Doctrines of Christiani- zareth, a man approved of God among you, ty, relating to the Unity of the supreme by Miracles, Wonders and Signs, which God God, and the one Mediator with him; so did by him in the midst of you: Again v. the Trinitarians have lost them both among 36. Let all the House of Israel know assur- their several Parties. For as they are di- edly, that God hath made that same Je- vided into two principal Parties (besides sus whom ye have Crucified, both Lord and several Sub-divisions) both among Confor- Christ. Now 'tis observable; the Apostle

was aiming at such a Description of Jesus properly Christ is most High God, is to Christ, as might strike the Hearts of his say the inferior is supreme, and the Man is *Murtherer*s with the greatest horror of their God; which cannot be, only by a Figure, Crime, v. 23. and therefore cou'd never as the Bread is Christ's Body, viz. by re-omit the most emphatical Branch of his *Lation*, &c. And truly if the Business can Description, viz. His *Infinite Deity*, if he be salved here; by making a personal U-had really been such; what a terrifying nion between God and Christ, I see not Argument had that been to beget Convic- why the Papists may not set up such an-
tion in his Persecutors beyond all the ther *Union* between Christ's Body and the rest, to tell them they had shed the Blood Bread in the Eucharist, and then they may of the *Infinite God himself*? 'Tis certainly stoutly defend that 'tis the Body of Christ all flat and low, that Peter says in compa- properly. But indeed nothing is more ob-
rison of this, viz. That he was but a *Man* vious than the unsteadiness of many Pro-
approved of God. Did he not understand, or testant Writers, when they write against would he betray his Cause by such an O- the Papists and the Unitarians: How do mission? And yet he only represents Christ they go backwards and forwards? And as a God by *Inhabitation* and Exaltation. when they have triumphantly and fully When he was far from being daunted with beaten off the vain Assaults and Obje- any fear to own Christ fully; nay, if this *Dei- ctions* of the Papists, they take up their *sy* of Christ were a fundamental Article of baffled Arguments, and urge them the *Christian Faith*, how comes it to pass, that same way (as others did against them) a-when poor convinced Souls, in anguish for gainst the Unitarians; and what they have their Crimes, seek Direction how to befa- maintained against the former, as good Ar-
ved from them? v. 37. The Apostle shou'd gument, notwithstanding Romish Evasi-not acquaint them with this Article, but ons; these Arguments they oppose, when directs them to believe in this Jesus, such the Unitarians turn them against them-as he had described him? Did he direct selves, in the point of the Trinity, and wounded Souls to an *insufficient Saviour*, they betake themselves to like Shifts and without telling 'em he was the infinite Evasions. Thus let the Papists object to God? Yet they are Baptiz'd and added to them the Novelty of the Protestant Reli-the Church, and numbred among such as gion, and ask them where was their Re-shall be saved: How can this be, if the ligion and Church before *Luther*? They supreme *Godhead* of Christ be a fundamen-think it a weak Cevil, and can tell 'em tal Article of the Christian Faith? So *Act*s their Religion was in the Bible, and v. 38. *God was with him*. This was all Church among the Primitive Christians, to conclude God and Christ (or one a- however it lay hid in the time of common nointed) are two *Disparates*, or different Apostacy; and yet to the Unitarian they Things, as much as Christ's *Body*, and can make the same Objection, where has *Bread* are, and therefore cannot be predi-any Christian Church for so many A-cated one of the other, in a proper sense, ges held that Christ was not God? A-or without a figure, as all our Writers a-gainst the Papist they will prove that the against the *Romish Transubstantiation*, argue. *Fathers* did not hold the Elements to be and is of equal force in the present case. Christ's real Body and Blood, because *To be anointed*, imports, to be raised by they oft call them the *Images* thereof: But Authority and Honour conferr'd; 'tis in let the Unitarian argue that Christ is not effect to say, the Person is a *Creature*, or the supreme God, because the Scripture inferior Being; and therefore to say that stiles him the *Image* of God; and there-fore

fore not the God whose Image only he is; al-
then, the thing it self and its image must
be the same thing: *Against* the Papist
they can prove S. Peter was inferior to the
Church, and the rest of the Apostles, (tho'
not singly to each) because he was sent up
and down by them: This *Baronius* takes
hold of, and tells them by the same rea-
son, they must grant the *Arians* Argument
to be good, *viz.* That the *Father* is greater
than the *Son*, because the *Son* is sent by
him: But let an *Unitarian* argue thus,
and then tho' the *Father* sends, and the *Son*
be sent by him, yet they shall both be e-
qual, and this shall make no difference:
Against the *Papists* they will boast, that they
don't hoodwink the People in Ignorance;
but bid them inquire and examine; and
the more the better, while 'tis ground of
Suspicion, that the *Papists* cheat Men, by
their keeping them from the Light; but
now having to do with the *Unitarians*,
they tack about, and bid beware of Read-
ing and Disputing; they are for an *impli-*
cite Faith, without examining into deep
Mysteries; they bid us believe, not pry in-
to them; tho' we only desire to examine
whether the *Scriptures* do reveal any such
Mysteries at all; the rest we will believe,
if we cou'd see that, and desire no other
liberty in interpreting Scripture, than they
take so justly, in interpreting Christ's words,
This is my Body. Upon Protestant Princi-
ples the *Unitarians* think they can stand
their ground, and defend themselves in
these Matters, as easily as the *Protestants*
can against the *Papists*.

As to Primitive Antiquity, so many *In-
quirers* both among the *Romish* and *Re-
formed* Writers, have given their impartial
Testimony, that it runs for *Arius's Do-
ctrine*, and have made such poor Apolo-
gies for those *Fathers*, as tho' they knew
not, or were not careful of their funda-
mental Articles of Faith, till they came to
be bandied about in General *Councils*, that
I think it not needful to say more here,

only one thing I wou'd suggest: That al-
lowing the Primitive Writers to speak in
different places with great, at least seeming
Discord (which any ingenuous Man must
grant) sometimes plainly declaring Jesus
Christ inferior to, and the *Servant* of the
Father, before his *Incarnation*; at other
times giving him high Titles, as of one
equal with *God*; yet 'tis far more reasona-
ble to suppose the higher Expressions shou'd
be expounded according to the other, than
the contrary; because in discoursing of,
and pleading for a *beloved* admired Ob-
ject, as the Lord *Jesus* deserves to be,
'tis very easy and natural to run out into
strains of Eloquence, and lofty flights of
Praise, which must be interpreted not
with strict Rigour, but with great Abate-
ments; as is to be observed in some of
their high *Encomiums* on the venerable
Mystery of the Eucharist, as tho' with the
Papists, they took the Elements for
Christ's real Body, which yet they evi-
dently did deny. But *on the contrary*, no
Men are wont ever to speak *diminutively*
on such occasions; they cou'd not have a
thought to lessen their Master's Glory;
and therefore if they ever represent him as
not the supreme God, nor equal to him,
we have all reason to think, they then
spake only the Words of Truth and Sober-
ness, what the exact Matter required.

For my own part, as I write this under
the serious Impressions of those great Re-
lations in which the Blessed *Jesus* stands
to me, whom I credit as my great *Teach-
er*; whom I desire to *admire* and love as
my gracious endeared *Benefactor*, beyond
Father or *Mother*, or Friends, &c. Whom
I reverence as my *Lord* and *Ruler*, and
solemnly *expect*, as my Final Glorious
Judge, who is to come in his own, and in
his *Fathers* Glory; *Luk. 9. 26*. And in the
mean time deal with *God* thro' him, as
my only *Mediator* and *Intercessor*: So I
earnestly profess, that 'tis not without
grievous and bitter Relentments, that I
shou'd

shon'd be employ'd in Writing Things, which by so many well-meaning Christians will be *misinterpreted*, to be derogatory to the Honour of this Great Redeemer ; but I know he loves nothing but Truth in his Cause, and will never be offended, I hope, with any who stand by his own Words, viz. *The Father is greater than I*, Joh. 14. 28. I think it a dangerous thing to say *God is not greater than he*, or is not the *Head of Christ*; for, *whom will ye equal to me, saith the Holy One?* Isa. 40. 25. I am perswaded 'tis Truth I plead for, and that Supports me :

However I wish they who are Adversaries to my Perswasion, wou'd learn at least the Modesty of one of the earliest Writers for Christianity since the Apostles, that we have, I mean *Justin Martyr*, who disputing with a Jew, and pleading for the Honour of Jesus Christ, whom he calls *a God by the Will of the Father*, and one who *ministered to his Will*, before his Incarnation : This Person attempts to shew, that Jesus Christ did *praexist* of old, as a God, (in *his sense*) and was born afterwards of a Virgin ; but because as he says, there were some who confessed him to be Christ, and yet denied those Points of his Praeexistence and his miraculous Birth of a Virgin, that Father calmly says to his Adverterary, *If I shall not demonstrate these things that he did praexist, &c. And was born of a Virgin; yet still, the Cause is not lost, as to his being the Christ of God; if I do not prove that he did Praexist, &c.* It is just to say that I am mistaken in this Thing only, and not to deny that he is the Christ; for whosoever he be, that is every way demonstrated, that he is the Christ. And as for those Christians who denied the abovesaid things, and held him to be only a Man, born in the ordinary way he only says of them ; to whom I accord not. He does not damn them who differed from him, nor will say the Christian Religion is subverted, and Christ but an *Impostor*, and a *Broken* i Absurdity;

Reed to trust on, if he be not the very supreme God, (the ranting *Dialect* of our profane Age) no, but still he was sure he is the true Christ, whatever else he might be mistaken in : 'Tis desperate wickednes in Men to hazard the Reputation of the Truth and Holiness of the blessed *Jesus*, upon a difficult and disputable *Opinion*; to dare to say, That if they are mistaken in their Opinion (which I verily believe) then Jesus Christ is a Liar and Deceiver, a *Mock Saviour*, and the like : What is this but to expose him to the Scorn of Infidels ?

So that I see, with sorrow, that to this very Day, even among professed Christians themselves, Christ Crucified is to some a Stumbling block, and to others Foolishness : If he be not as Good and Great, as the God who appointed him for a *Saviour*, tho' he be allowed to be a *Man approved of God*, by Signs and mighty Wonders which God did by him ; and by whom God made the *Worlds*, as the Instrument; tho' he be granted to be *One in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead*, Joh. 14: 10. So as it never dwelt before in Prophets or any other; tho' he be *One with the Father*, by Unity of Consent and Will, as *Calvin* interprets Joh. 10. 30. One in testimony with the Father and Spirit, as *Berza* and many others understand that in 1 John 5: 7. Tho' he be the most lively visible *image* of God that the World ever saw, so that he who sees him, does in great measure *see the Father*, as in a bright *Mirror*, Joh. 14. 10. Tho' he be owned and served, as one far above Angels, and Archangels; and over all Powers in Heaven and Earth, a *God or Ruler*: The great *Administrator* of God's Kingdom, both on Earth, and in the invisible *Hades*, as having the *Keys*, or Ministerial Power of Death and Hell, Rev. 1: 18. Yet after all this, if he be not the very supreme God himself; nay to compleat the absurdity; if he be not the same very God.

God, whose Son and Image, he is; He shall History, that this *Doctrine has kept more
be no Mediator for them*; they do ex *Hy-* People from embracing the Christian Faith;
pothesi; or on this Supposition, openly dis- than any other thing he knew of. Now tho'
own him for their Saviour and Confidence; I grant, that if it be the certain Truth of
they are *ashamed* to trust in him, and seem God, this must be no argument against
rather to Deride and Reproach him, as receiving it; yet surely it shou'd make
Insufficient and Contemptible, than to Be- Men very cautious and impartial in their In-
lieve on him. These things are to me quiry about it, lest they bring on themselves
a very grievous Offence, who think it a the *Wo* denounced against them, by whom
great pity, that so excellent a Constitution Offences (that is, Stumbling blocks in the
as the Gospel is, so *amiable* to contem- way of the Gospel) do come.

plate, so proper to entertain our thankful In the mean time, in midst of these Trou-
Admiration, for the Grace and Wisdom it bles, 'tis a great and sweet Refreshment to wait
contains, shou'd either be lost in the clouds and hope for a Remove to the Mount Mo-
of an affected Obscurity, or exposed to riah, the Land of Vision above, where all
the derision of ungodly Scoffers. these Shades of the melancholly Night

'Tis yet a further grief to think what a shall vanish away, and an eternal Day
fatal stop is hereby put to the Progress of of clear Light and Peace shall shine on
the Gospel, whose Rejection by Jews, Ma- them who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity,
Monetans and Pagans, is undeniably occa- in whose glorious Dignity I rejoice; nay;
sioned by the common Doctrine of the In- I desire to boast and Glory in this Exalted,
carnation of God; one may read in Le Enthroned Redeemer; for worthy is the
Compte's History of China, how the Hea- Lamb to receive Glory, and Honour and
thens derided the Christians Doctrine of a Blessing and Power, Azien; So be it!

Mortal God; and upon that account look'd Now to Him who loved us, and wash-
upon Christianity as fabulous, as their own ed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and
Religion: And Doctor Causabon, in his Book hath made us Kings and Priests to God;
of Credulity and Incredulity, p. 118. Says even the Father, to Him be Glory and
he could prove by many Instances out of Dominion for ever.

*But this I confess unto thee, that after the way, which they call Heresy, so Worship I the
God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the
Prophets, Acts 24. 14.*